

# META-CODE: Community Detection via Exploratory Learning in Topologically Unknown Networks

Yu Hou  
Yonsei University  
Seoul, Republic of Korea  
houyu@yonsei.ac.kr

Cong Tran  
Posts and Telecommunications  
Institute of Technology  
Hanoi, Vietnam  
congtr@ptit.edu.vn

Won-Yong Shin\*  
Yonsei University  
Seoul, Republic of Korea  
wy.shin@yonsei.ac.kr

## ABSTRACT

The discovery of community structures in social networks has gained considerable attention as a fundamental problem for various network analysis tasks. However, due to privacy concerns or access restrictions, the network structure is often *unknown*, thereby rendering established community detection approaches ineffective without costly data acquisition. To tackle this challenge, we present META-CODE, a novel end-to-end solution for detecting overlapping communities in networks with unknown topology via *exploratory learning* aided by *easy-to-collect* node metadata. Specifically, META-CODE consists of three steps: 1) initial network inference, 2) node-level community-affiliation embedding based on graph neural networks (GNNs) trained by our new reconstruction loss, and 3) network exploration via community-affiliation-based node queries, where Steps 2 and 3 are performed iteratively. Experimental results demonstrate that META-CODE exhibits (a) superiority over benchmark methods for overlapping community detection, (b) the effectiveness of our training model, and (c) fast network exploration.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → *Social networks; Clustering.*

## KEYWORDS

Community detection, exploratory learning, graph neural network (GNN), node query, topologically unknown network

## ACM Reference Format:

Yu Hou, Cong Tran, and Won-Yong Shin. 2022. META-CODE: Community Detection via Exploratory Learning in Topologically Unknown Networks. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '22)*, October 17–21, 2022, Atlanta, GA, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3511808.3557639>

\*Corresponding author

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).  
*CIKM '22, October 17–21, 2022, Atlanta, GA, USA*

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.  
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9236-5/22/10...\$15.00  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3511808.3557639>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Community detection [1, 2, 5, 9, 14, 23] is an indispensable task in network analyses to understand the fundamental features of networks. Community detection algorithms should be designed by taking into account the inherently overlapping nature since community memberships in social networks are allowed to overlap as nodes belong to multiple clusters at once [15, 18, 24–27].

Nevertheless, the underlying *true* network is not initially known in various domains of real-world network applications [20]. Thus, existing downstream graph mining approaches are often ineffective without retrieving relationships among nodes in a network, which is very labor-intensive. To overcome this problem, *exploratory* influence maximization was introduced along with a solution to perform information retrieval over unknown networks by querying individual nodes to explore their neighborhoods, while aiming at discovering the set of seed nodes leading to the maximum influence spread [4, 19, 21, 22]. However, the aforementioned studies focused on solving the problem of influence maximization; the research related to community detection via exploratory learning has been largely underexplored yet.

In social networks, node metadata can often be retrieved from a variety of sources such as user-created content over given (social) networks [10] or even be inferred from users' behavior [8], thereby making them more readily available than the relationship between individuals. In this paper, motivated by the fact that collecting such node metadata is relatively *easy-to-collect* and cost-effective [10], we present META-CODE, a novel end-to-end framework for overlapping community detection in networks with unknown topology via *exploratory learning* that retrieves information from both node queries and node metadata. As the first step of META-CODE, we infer the network structure by using both the multi-assignment clustering (MAC) [16] and the *community-affiliation graph model (AGM)* [24]. Then, META-CODE performs the following two steps *iteratively*: we generate node-level community-affiliation embeddings based on graph neural networks (GNNs) trained by our new loss function, which is established for preserving structural and attribute information; and, for network exploration, we identify the next node to query based on the discovered community affiliations.

Through comprehensive experiments using real-world datasets, we demonstrate that META-CODE consistently outperforms benchmark methods for overlapping community detection. We also validate the effectiveness of both our network inference module and our training model in GNNs. Moreover, the proposed node query strategy in META-CODE shows faster network exploration than competing sampling strategies, thus potentially leading to superior performance on community detection.




Figure 1: The schematic overview of META-CODE when a query budget  $T$  is given by 3.

## 2 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Basic Settings and Problem Definition

Let us denote an underlying network as  $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ , which is initially unavailable, where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the set of  $N$  nodes and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the set of edges. We assume  $G$  to be an undirected unweighted *attributed* network having collectible node metadata  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$  of binary-valued node features<sup>1</sup>, where  $D$  is the dimension of each feature vector. We assume that social networks follow the AGM [24], which can be represented by a non-negative weight affiliation matrix  $F \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$  regarded as node-level community-affiliation embeddings, where  $C$  is the number of communities and  $F_u$  is the affiliations of node  $u$ . Following the concept of active learning [2,12], we are allowed to perform  $T$  node queries given a query budget  $T$  for network exploration. When we query a single node, we are capable of discovering neighbors of the queried node. The observable subgraph can then be expanded accordingly, which essentially follows the same setting as prior work [13, 21, 22].

**Problem definition:** Given an initially unknown network  $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ , node metadata  $\mathcal{X}$ , and  $T$  node queries, we aim to assign nodes to  $C$  overlapping communities.

<sup>1</sup>Non binary-valued node features can be transferred to binary values via one-hot encoding [11].

### 2.2 Methodology

**2.2.1 Overview of META-CODE.** We describe our META-CODE method composed of three steps. The schematic overview of META-CODE for  $T = 3$  is illustrated in Figure 1.

In Step 1, we discover the initial communities using the MAC [16] that assigns nodes to multiple communities based on the node metadata  $\mathcal{X}$ . We then infer the network, denoted as  $G_0 = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_0)$ , from the initially discovered communities using the AGM, where  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is the set of initially inferred edges. The function of initial network inference is denoted as  $G_0 = f_{\text{init}}(\mathcal{X})$ . In Step 2, we generate node-level community-affiliation embeddings by designing a new GNN model. Specifically, we build a GNN architecture and then train our GNN model by establishing our own reconstruction loss in terms of preserving structural and attribute information. In Step 3, we explore a subgraph by selecting an influential node through the query process. To this end, we present our query node selection strategy, which is inspired by the claim that querying nodes not only belonging to more communities but also being distributed over diverse communities is more influential in enabling the explored subgraph to grow faster, thus resulting in potentially better performance on community detection. This claim will be empirically validated in Section 3. In Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3, we elaborate on the embedding and network exploration steps, respectively.

**2.2.2 Community-Affiliation Embedding via GNNs.** Let  $G_t = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_t)$  denote the discovered network whose explored parts are expanded by replacing the connectivity information with some amount of uncertainty for a queried node at the  $t$ -th query step ( $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ ) by connections between the queried node and its neighbors, as depicted in Figure 1. Using the discovered network  $G_t$  and node metadata  $\mathcal{X}$ , we aim at designing our GNN model to generate node-level embeddings that are represented as a non-negative weight affiliation matrix  $F$ :

$$F := GNN_{\theta}(G_t, \mathcal{X}). \quad (1)$$

Toward this goal, we would like to characterize the following two relationships.

**Structure-community relationship:** Given the affiliation matrix  $F$ , the probability of having an edge between two nodes  $u$  and  $v$  can be modeled as  $1 - \exp(-F_u F_v^T)$ , which is built upon the probabilistic generative model in [25]. This implies that, if a pair of nodes belongs to more communities in common, then the probability that the node pair is connected becomes higher. In this context, the negative log-likelihood (NLL) can be formulated as  $\mathcal{L}_1(F) = -\log P(G_t|F)$ .

**Metadata-community relationship:** Intuitively, there exists a relationship between node metadata and nodes' affiliations. According to attribute modeling in [26], the  $d$ -th attribute  $\mathcal{X}_{ud}$  of node  $u$  can be probabilistically modeled as

$$Q_{ud} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\sum_c W_{dc} \cdot F_{uc})}, \quad (2)$$

where  $F_{uc}$  is the  $c$ -th entry in  $F_u$ , and  $W_{dc}$ , the  $(d, c)$ -th entry of weight matrix  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times C}$ , indicates the relevance of community  $c$  to the  $d$ -th node feature. Thus, the NLL can be formulated as  $\mathcal{L}_2(F) = -\log P(\mathcal{X}|F, W)$ .

**Model training:** Based on the two relationships above, we establish our reconstruction loss as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{F}) &= \mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{F}) + \eta \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{F}) \\ &= - \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{E}_t} \log \left( 1 - \exp \left( -\mathbf{F}_u \mathbf{F}_v^T \right) \right) + \sum_{(u,v) \notin \mathcal{E}_t} \mathbf{F}_u \mathbf{F}_v^T \\ &\quad - \eta \sum_{u,d} (\mathcal{X}_{ud} \log Q_{ud} + (1 - \mathcal{X}_{ud}) \log (1 - Q_{ud})), \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta \geq 0$  is the hyperparameter to balance between two terms. Note that the first and second terms in Eq. (3) aim at reconstructing the network structure and node metadata, respectively. We update the parameters  $\theta$  of our GNN model in the sense of minimizing the loss function.

**2.2.3 Network Exploration via Node Queries.** As stated in Section 2.1, we discover neighbors of each queried node for network exploration. Thus, we are interested in how to select the set of  $T$  queried nodes. Although querying high-degree nodes is expected to make the explored subgraph grow fastest, it may not be true as long as the community detection task is concerned; moreover, such topology-aware query strategies would not be feasible due to the *neighbor unawareness* of nodes (e.g., the degree of each node) beforehand. In our study, the node query strategy is built upon our claim that each queried node should not only belong to more communities but also be distributed over diverse communities for faster network exploration. In this context, we select the  $t$ -th node to query for  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$  according to the following formulation:

$$\hat{u}_t = \arg \max_u \left( \|F_u\|_1 + \lambda \left( 1 - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}_t|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{P}_t} \text{sim}(F_u, F_v) \right) \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is  $L_1$ -norm of a vector,  $\mathcal{P}_t$  is the set of queried nodes up to the  $t$ -th iteration,  $\lambda \geq 0$  is the hyperparameter to balance between two terms, and  $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the cosine similarity. Here, the second term in Eq. (4) controls a node to be selected from communities different from those of previous queried nodes.

### 3 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

**Datasets.** We conduct our experiments on two Facebook datasets [11], which are ego-networks collected from Facebook social networks, and one large network dataset, Engineering, which is a co-authorship network constructed from the Microsoft Academic Graph [12] where communities correspond to research areas and node metadata are based on keywords of the papers by each author<sup>2</sup>.

**Performance metrics.** We quantify the degree of agreement between the ground truth communities and the detected communities by adopting the normalized mutual information (NMI) and the  $F_1$  score. We note that the two metrics are in a range of  $[0, 1]$ , and higher values represent better performance.

**Benchmark methods.** We present three benchmark methods for overlapping community detection: **BIGCLAM** [25] learns the affiliation matrix using a block coordinate gradient ascent algorithm;

**vGraph** [17] jointly performs community detection and node representation learning based on a generative model; and **NOCD** [15] discovers overlapping communities via GNNs using the network structure and node metadata. Since the above benchmark methods were originally developed for *fully observable* networks, we need to first infer the network structure. To this end, we employ two sampling strategies for network exploration via node queries: random sampling (RS) and depth-first search (DFS)<sup>3</sup>. Similarly as in META-CODE, we iteratively perform community detection alongside the explored network via sampling given a budget of node queries. We implement all these benchmark methods through the parameter settings mentioned in the original articles.

**Experimental setup.** In our experiments, we adopt GCN [7] with 2 layers as a popular GNN architecture to extract the community-affiliation embeddings. We train our GNN model using Adam optimizer [6] with a learning rate of 0.001. All models are implemented via a geometric learning library, named PyTorch Geometric [3]. We tune the hyperparameter  $\eta$  within a designated range  $\eta \in [1.0, 2.0]$ , which leads to substantial gains over the case of  $\eta = 0$  corresponding to the GNN model trained in the sense of preserving the structural information only. We also tune the hyperparameter  $\lambda$  within a designated range  $\lambda \in [0.0, 3.0]$ .

**Research questions.** Our empirical study is designed to answer the following three key research questions (RQs).

- RQ1. How much does the META-CODE method improve the performance of community detection over the benchmark methods?
- RQ2. How effective is our initial network inference module for accurate community detection?
- RQ3. How effective is our node query strategy for fast network exploration?

**(RQ1) Comparison with benchmark methods.** The performance comparison between our META-CODE method and three benchmark methods with two different sampling strategies is comprehensively presented in Table 1 with respect to two performance metrics using three real-world datasets when different portions of nodes are queried among  $N$  nodes. We observe the following: 1) META-CODE consistently outperforms benchmark methods; 2) the performance improvement of META-CODE over the second best performer is the largest when 40% nodes are queried on Facebook 0—the maximum gain of 23.56% is achieved in terms of the NMI; and 3) the second best performer tends to be NOCD with RS in most cases since NOCD also generates community-affiliation embeddings via GNNs, which is more capable of precisely discovering communities.

**(RQ2) Effectiveness of initial network inference.** We investigate the effect of our initial network inference module based on the MAC and AGM on the performance of META-CODE in comparison with the case of using a  $k$ -nearest neighbor ( $k$ NN)-aided strategy. The performance comparison between two different strategies is presented in Table 2 with respect to the NMI when 10% of node are queried. Our observations include that 1) META-CODE

<sup>2</sup>Although there are other Facebook and large co-authorship networks, we have not further adopted them since they exhibit similar tendencies to those of the above three datasets under consideration.

<sup>3</sup>Although other sophisticated sampling strategies such as biased random walks can also be employed, they were not employed in our study since they reveal similar tendencies to those of RS and DFS.

**Table 1: Performance comparison of META-CODE and six competing methods in terms of two metrics (average  $\pm$  standard deviation) when different portions (%) of nodes are queried among  $N$  nodes. Here, the best and second best performers are highlighted by bold and underline, respectively.**


Dataset	Method	10% queried nodes		20% queried nodes		30% queried nodes		40% queried nodes	
		NMI	$F_1$ score	NMI	$F_1$ score	NMI	$F_1$ score	NMI	$F_1$ score
Facebook 0	BIGCLAM+RS	0.0058 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.4048 $\pm$ 0.0092	0.0189 $\pm$ 0.0088	0.4253 $\pm$ 0.0156	0.0252 $\pm$ 0.0094	0.4535 $\pm$ 0.0056	0.0348 $\pm$ 0.0095	0.5168 $\pm$ 0.0046
	BIGCLAM+DFS	0.0206 $\pm$ 0.0092	0.4131 $\pm$ 0.0108	0.0218 $\pm$ 0.0047	0.4217 $\pm$ 0.0426	0.0242 $\pm$ 0.0095	0.4514 $\pm$ 0.0147	0.0263 $\pm$ 0.0112	0.4576 $\pm$ 0.0652
	vGraph+RS	0.0079 $\pm$ 0.0036	0.4102 $\pm$ 0.0681	0.0195 $\pm$ 0.0130	0.4989 $\pm$ 0.0482	0.0217 $\pm$ 0.0058	0.5026 $\pm$ 0.0233	0.0410 $\pm$ 0.0131	0.5429 $\pm$ 0.0480
	vGraph+DFS	0.0180 $\pm$ 0.0070	0.4826 $\pm$ 0.0269	0.0301 $\pm$ 0.0077	0.5029 $\pm$ 0.0147	0.0321 $\pm$ 0.0116	0.5066 $\pm$ 0.0237	0.0335 $\pm$ 0.0035	0.5173 $\pm$ 0.0186
	NOCD+RS	0.0256 $\pm$ 0.0312	0.5052 $\pm$ 0.0431	0.0328 $\pm$ 0.0301	0.5319 $\pm$ 0.0216	0.0447 $\pm$ 0.0234	0.5539 $\pm$ 0.0676	0.0450 $\pm$ 0.0157	0.6047 $\pm$ 0.0395
	NOCD+DFS	0.0198 $\pm$ 0.0057	0.5018 $\pm$ 0.0504	0.0290 $\pm$ 0.0029	0.5467 $\pm$ 0.0128	0.0308 $\pm$ 0.0216	0.5506 $\pm$ 0.0294	0.0391 $\pm$ 0.0243	0.5938 $\pm$ 0.0551
	META-CODE	<b>0.0298</b> $\pm$ 0.0157	<b>0.5119</b> $\pm$ 0.0432	<b>0.0357</b> $\pm$ 0.0348	<b>0.5596</b> $\pm$ 0.0313	<b>0.0463</b> $\pm$ 0.0155	<b>0.5623</b> $\pm$ 0.0484	<b>0.0556</b> $\pm$ 0.0119	<b>0.6102</b> $\pm$ 0.0433
Facebook 348	BIGCLAM+RS	0.0263 $\pm$ 0.0056	0.4349 $\pm$ 0.0213	0.0539 $\pm$ 0.0193	0.5025 $\pm$ 0.0681	0.0703 $\pm$ 0.0135	0.5896 $\pm$ 0.0117	0.1083 $\pm$ 0.0162	0.6503 $\pm$ 0.1299
	BIGCLAM+DFS	0.0379 $\pm$ 0.0057	0.4757 $\pm$ 0.0115	0.0571 $\pm$ 0.0211	0.5364 $\pm$ 0.0351	0.0657 $\pm$ 0.0197	0.5452 $\pm$ 0.0733	0.0785 $\pm$ 0.0139	0.5987 $\pm$ 0.0448
	vGraph+RS	0.0559 $\pm$ 0.0152	0.5700 $\pm$ 0.0149	0.0914 $\pm$ 0.0089	0.7046 $\pm$ 0.0550	0.1332 $\pm$ 0.0116	0.7233 $\pm$ 0.0461	0.1573 $\pm$ 0.0098	0.7708 $\pm$ 0.0398
	vGraph+DFS	0.0601 $\pm$ 0.0221	0.5526 $\pm$ 0.0527	0.0943 $\pm$ 0.0104	0.6614 $\pm$ 0.0288	0.1030 $\pm$ 0.0180	0.7079 $\pm$ 0.0584	0.1272 $\pm$ 0.0103	0.7297 $\pm$ 0.0356
	NOCD+RS	0.0704 $\pm$ 0.0191	0.6503 $\pm$ 0.0960	0.1022 $\pm$ 0.0089	0.6627 $\pm$ 0.0836	0.1422 $\pm$ 0.0111	0.7445 $\pm$ 0.0168	0.1958 $\pm$ 0.0191	0.7652 $\pm$ 0.0399
	NOCD+DFS	0.0594 $\pm$ 0.0111	0.5471 $\pm$ 0.0283	0.0965 $\pm$ 0.0213	0.6568 $\pm$ 0.0616	0.1329 $\pm$ 0.0218	0.7352 $\pm$ 0.0713	0.1683 $\pm$ 0.0247	0.7885 $\pm$ 0.0542
	META-CODE	<b>0.0791</b> $\pm$ 0.0198	<b>0.6842</b> $\pm$ 0.0343	<b>0.1132</b> $\pm$ 0.0167	<b>0.7221</b> $\pm$ 0.0567	<b>0.1578</b> $\pm$ 0.0169	<b>0.7923</b> $\pm$ 0.0493	<b>0.2003</b> $\pm$ 0.0164	<b>0.8218</b> $\pm$ 0.0085
Engineering	BIGCLAM+RS	0.0000 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.1315 $\pm$ 0.0386	0.0000 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.2635 $\pm$ 0.0207	0.0000 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.3015 $\pm$ 0.0531	0.0144 $\pm$ 0.0133	0.4659 $\pm$ 0.0317
	BIGCLAM+DFS	0.0029 $\pm$ 0.0066	0.3460 $\pm$ 0.0370	0.0194 $\pm$ 0.0123	0.4530 $\pm$ 0.0674	0.0406 $\pm$ 0.0192	0.5160 $\pm$ 0.0351	0.0590 $\pm$ 0.0088	0.5980 $\pm$ 0.0387
	vGraph+RS	0.0000 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.1972 $\pm$ 0.0282	0.0000 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.3334 $\pm$ 0.0080	0.0334 $\pm$ 0.0042	0.4702 $\pm$ 0.0188	0.0522 $\pm$ 0.0116	0.5877 $\pm$ 0.0913
	vGraph+DFS	0.0000 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.3219 $\pm$ 0.0084	0.0281 $\pm$ 0.0114	0.4449 $\pm$ 0.0642	0.0368 $\pm$ 0.0054	0.4811 $\pm$ 0.0820	0.0504 $\pm$ 0.0194	0.5217 $\pm$ 0.0137
	NOCD+RS	0.1262 $\pm$ 0.0219	0.7081 $\pm$ 0.0277	0.2148 $\pm$ 0.0113	0.7924 $\pm$ 0.0367	0.2875 $\pm$ 0.0182	0.8387 $\pm$ 0.0238	0.3128 $\pm$ 0.0175	0.8529 $\pm$ 0.0370
	NOCD+DFS	0.1466 $\pm$ 0.0322	0.7542 $\pm$ 0.0598	0.2046 $\pm$ 0.0185	0.7760 $\pm$ 0.0638	0.2702 $\pm$ 0.0158	0.8261 $\pm$ 0.0304	0.3038 $\pm$ 0.0172	0.8427 $\pm$ 0.0178
	META-CODE	<b>0.1575</b> $\pm$ 0.0371	<b>0.7613</b> $\pm$ 0.0193	<b>0.2177</b> $\pm$ 0.0207	<b>0.8079</b> $\pm$ 0.0193	<b>0.2921</b> $\pm$ 0.0169	<b>0.8431</b> $\pm$ 0.0177	<b>0.3191</b> $\pm$ 0.0302	<b>0.8581</b> $\pm$ 0.0175

**Table 2: Performance comparison of META-CODE with two different initial network inference strategies in terms of the NMI when 10% of nodes are queried.**

Dataset	META-CODE ( $k$ NN)	META-CODE (MAC+AGM)
Facebook 0	0.0272 $\pm$ 0.0194	<b>0.0298</b> $\pm$ 0.0157
Facebook 348	0.0772 $\pm$ 0.0174	<b>0.0791</b> $\pm$ 0.0198
Engineering	0.1431 $\pm$ 0.0204	<b>0.1575</b> $\pm$ 0.0371

(MAC+AGM) is consistently superior to META-CODE ( $k$ NN) and 2) the maximum gain of 9.55% is achieved on Facebook 0.

**(RQ3) Growth of explored subgraphs.** To empirically validate the effectiveness of our node query strategy, we conduct experiments by plotting the number of explored nodes (i.e., the size of explored subgraphs), denoted as  $N_{ex}$ , versus a portion of queried nodes in Figure 2 in comparison with two cases in which two sampling strategies (i.e., RS and DFS) are employed for network exploration in META-CODE rather than Eq. (4). Our findings are summarized as follows: 1) our query strategy based on the discovered community affiliations is consistently beneficial over other samplings with respect to the growth of explored subgraphs by exploring the unknown parts of the underlying network faster; and 2) the growth rate of  $N_{ex}$  for RS is even higher than that for DFS since querying nodes away from explored subgraphs via RS (instead of expanding the explored subgraph via DFS) is more effective as the number of queried nodes increases.



**Figure 2: The number of explored nodes,  $N_{ex}$ , according to different portions (%) of queried nodes among  $N$  nodes.**

## 4 CONCLUDING REMARKS

We introduced META-CODE, a novel end-to-end solution for overlapping community detection in networks with unknown topology. Our META-CODE method was designed in such a way of leveraging limited node queries and node metadata to iteratively generate GNN-based embeddings and identify queried nodes after initial network inference. Using three real-world datasets, we demonstrated (a) the superiority of META-CODE over competitors with substantial gains up to 23.56% and (b) the effectiveness of key components in META-CODE such as the initial network inference module and the network exploration module via node queries.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (No. 2021R1A2C3004345).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Cheng Cao, Zhengzhang Chen, James Caverlee, Lu-An Tang, Chen Luo, and Zhichun Li. 2018. Behavior-based Community Detection: Application to Host Assessment in Enterprise Information Networks. In *Proc. 27th ACM Int. Conf. Inf. Knowl. Manage. (CIKM '18)* (Torino, Italy). 1977–1985.
- [2] Daizong Ding, Mi Zhang, Hanrui Wang, Xudong Pan, Min Yang, and Xiangnan He. 2021. A Deep Learning Framework for Self-evolving Hierarchical Community Detection. In *Proc. 30th ACM Int. Conf. Inf. Knowl. Manage. (CIKM '21)* (Virtual Event). 372–381.
- [3] Matthias Fey and Jan Eric Lenssen. 2019. Fast Graph Representation Learning with PyTorch Geometric. In *Proc. 7th ICLR Workshop on Representation Learning on Graphs and Manifolds* (New Orleans, LA).
- [4] Harshavardhan Kamarthi, Priyesh Vijayan, Bryan Wilder, Balaraman Ravindran, and Milind Tambe. 2020. Influence Maximization in Unknown Social Networks: Learn Policies for Effective Graph Sampling. In *Proc. 19th Int. Conf. Auton. Agents Multiagent Syst. (AAMAS '20)* (Auckland, New Zealand). 575–583.
- [5] Yoonsuk Kang, Jun Seok Lee, Won-Yong Shin, and Sang-Wook Kim. 2020. Cr-graph: Community Reinforcement for Accurate Community Detection. In *Proc. 29th ACM Int. Conf. Inf. Knowl. Manage. (CIKM '20)* (Virtual Event). 2077–2080.
- [6] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *Proc. 3rd Int. Conf. Learn. Representations (ICLR '15)* (San Diego, CA).
- [7] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2017. Semi-supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. In *Proc. 5th Int. Conf. Learn. Representations (ICLR '17)* (Toulon, France).
- [8] Michal Kosinski, David Stillwell, and Thore Graepel. 2013. Private Traits and Attributes are Predictable from Digital Records of Human Behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, 15 (2013), 5802–5805.
- [9] Andrea Lancichinetti and Santo Fortunato. 2009. Community Detection Algorithms: A Comparative Analysis. *Physical Review E* 80, 5 (2009), 056117.
- [10] Vincent Leroy, B Barla Cambazoglu, and Francesco Bonchi. 2010. Cold Start Link Prediction. In *Proc. 16th Int. Conf. Knowl. Disc. Data Mining (KDD '10)* (Washington, DC). 393–402.
- [11] Jure Leskovec and Julian McAuley. 2012. Learning to Discover Social Circles in Ego Networks. In *Proc. 26th Annu. Conf. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS '12)* (Lake Tahoe, Nevada). 548–556.
- [12] Microsoft. 2015. Announcing the Microsoft Academic Graph: Let the Research Begin! <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/blog/announcing-the-microsoft-academic-graph-let-the-research-begin/>.
- [13] Shodai Mihara, Sho Tsugawa, and Hiroyuki Ohsaki. 2015. Influence Maximization Problem for Unknown Social Networks. In *Proc. 7th Int. Conf. Advances Social Netw. Anal. Mining (ASONAM '15)* (Paris, France). 1539–1546.
- [14] Symeon Papadopoulos, Yiannis Kompatsiaris, Athena Vakali, and Ploutarchos Spyridonos. 2012. Community Detection in Social Media. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 24, 3 (2012), 515–554.
- [15] Aleksandr Shchur and Stephan Günnemann. 2019. Overlapping Community Detection with Graph Neural Networks. In *Proc. 25th ACM SIGKDD Workshop on Deep Learning on Graphs: Methods and Applications* (Anchorage, AK).
- [16] Andreas P Streich, Mario Frank, David Basin, and Joachim M Buhmann. 2009. Multi-assignment Clustering for Boolean Data. In *Proc. 26th Int. Conf. Mach. Learn. (ICML '18)* (Montreal, Quebec). 969–976.
- [17] Fan-Yun Sun, Meng Qu, Jordan Hoffmann, Chin-Wei Huang, and Jian Tang. 2019. vGraph: A Generative Model for Joint Community Detection and Node Representation Learning. In *Proc. 33rd Annu. Conf. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS '19)* (Vancouver, BC, Canada). 512–522.
- [18] Cong Tran, Won-Yong Shin, and Andreas Spitz. 2021. Community Detection in Partially Observable Social Networks. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)* 16, 2 (2021), 1–24.
- [19] Cong Tran, Won-Yong Shin, and Andreas Spitz. 2021. IM-META: Influence Maximization Using Node Metadata in Networks with Unknown Topology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.02926* (2021).
- [20] Thomas W Valente and Patchareeya Pumpuang. 2007. Identifying Opinion Leaders to Promote Behavior Change. *Health Education & Behavior* 34, 6 (2007), 881–896.
- [21] Bryan Wilder, Nicole Immerlica, Eric Rice, and Milind Tambe. 2018. Maximizing Influence in an Unknown Social Network. In *Proc. 32nd Conf. Artif. Intell. (AAAI '18)* (New Orleans, LA), Vol. 32. 1–8.
- [22] Bryan Wilder, Laura Onasch-Vera, Juliana Hudson, Jose Luna, Nicole Wilson, Robin Petering, Darlene Woo, Milind Tambe, and Eric Rice. 2018. End-to-End Influence Maximization in the Field. In *Proc. 17th Int. Conf. Auton. Agents Multiagent Syst. (AAMAS '18)* (Stockholm, Sweden), Vol. 18. 1414–1422.
- [23] Jierui Xie, Stephen Kelley, and Boleslaw K Szymanski. 2013. Overlapping Community Detection in Networks: The State-of-the-art and Comparative Study. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 45, 4 (2013), 1–35.
- [24] Jaewon Yang and Jure Leskovec. 2012. Community-affiliation Graph Model for Overlapping Network Community Detection. In *Proc. 12th Int. Conf. Data Mining* (Brussels, Belgium). IEEE, 1170–1175.
- [25] Jaewon Yang and Jure Leskovec. 2013. Overlapping Community Detection at Scale: a Nonnegative Matrix Factorization Approach. In *Proc. 6th ACM Int. Conf. Web Search Data Mining* (Rome, Italy). 587–596.
- [26] Jaewon Yang, Julian McAuley, and Jure Leskovec. 2013. Community Detection in Networks with Node Attributes. In *Proc. 13th Int. Conf. Data Mining* (Dallas, TX). IEEE, 1151–1156.
- [27] Fanghua Ye, Chuan Chen, and Zibin Zheng. 2018. Deep Autoencoder-like Non-negative Matrix Factorization for Community Detection. In *Proc. 27th ACM Int. Conf. Inf. Knowl. Manage. (CIKM '18)* (Torino, Italy). 1393–1402.